



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/210,995	12/15/1998	SHEENA M. LOOSMORE	1038-844MIS:	7731

7590

01/24/2002

SIM & MCBURNEY
330 UNIVERSITY AVENUE
6TH FLOOR
TORONTO, M5G1R7
CANADA

EXAMINER

HINES, JANA A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1645

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/210,995

Applicant(s)

LOOSMORE ET AL

Examiner

Ja-Na A Hines

Art Unit

1645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-5 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the second amendment after final filed on October 22, 2001, ^{and reply brief of 10-22-01}

<sup>1/22/02
PAS</sup> PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below. A rebuttal of the reply brief is set forth supra.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
- (2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

It should be noted that the appeal brief contains errors:

- a) Final rejection statement (c) is incorrect; and
- b) the appendix of claims does not match the current status of claims.

Amendment Entry

2. Applicant's second amendment after final action filed October 22, 2001 has been entered. Applicant's amendment of claim 22, filed October 16, 2000 has also been entered. Claims 1-5 have been cancelled. Claim 24 has been amended. Claims 6-24 are under consideration in the action.

Grounds For Rejection

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 6-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barenkamp et al., (WO 97/36,914) in view of Loosmore et al. (US Patent 5,506,139). The rejection was on the grounds that Barenkamp et al., (WO 97/36,914), teach high molecular weight (HMW) surface proteins of non-typeable *Haemophilus*. The high molecular weight surface proteins of non-typeable *Haemophilus influenzae* that exhibit immunogenic properties and genes encoding for immunodominant high molecular weight proteins, HMW1, HMW2, HMW3 and HMW4. HMW3 and HMW4 show considerable homology to HMW1 and HMW2 thus HMW3 and HMW4 are also likely to function as adhesins (page 18 lines 14-17). These HMW proteins are related to filamentous hemagglutinin surface proteins, wherein these proteins cause an increased antibody response (page 5 lines 30-35). The immune response to these proteins may be either humoral or a cell-mediated (page 7 lines 18-25). The invention teaches an immunogenic composition comprising the novel high molecular weight protein or synthetic peptides along with a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier for in vivo administration to a host (page 6 lines 20-27). The immunogenic composition may

Art Unit: 1645

comprise at least one other immunogenic or immunostimulating material and at least one adjuvant (page 7 lines 1-5). Barenkamp et al.(WO 97/36,914), teach a long list of suitable adjuvants including aluminum phosphate and aluminum hydroxide (page 7 lines 6-17). The high molecular weight proteins can be produced recombinantly (page 10 lines 21-25) and the HMW1 and HMW2 have an apparent molecular weight of 125 and 120 kDa respectively when produced from non-typeable *Haemophilus* (page 15 lines 21-24); while HMW3 and HMW4 have apparent molecular weights of 125 and 123 kDa from non-typeable *Haemophilus*. One example illustrates the use of HMW antigens composed in an immunogenic composition containing 40ug of HMW protein and Freund's adjuvant, the mixture was administered to a host (chinchillas) infected with *Haemophilus influenzae* causing otitis media (pages 47-48 lines 29-33). Barenkamp et al., (WO 97/36,914), teach complexing additional components to the antigenic composition to enhance immune response including herpes simplex virus vaccine, pseudorabies virus vaccine, tetanus toxoid, poliomyelitis virus vaccine, hepatitis B virus antigen and others (page 24-25 lines 7-10). Finally, Barenkamp et al, (WO 97/36,914), data teach that the adhesin proteins are potentially important protective antigens which should comprise one component of a multi-component non-typeable *H. influenzae* vaccine (page 49 lines 15-19). Barenkamp et al.(WO 97/36,914), however do not teach the use of a different antigen of *H.influenzae* which is not an adhesin in an immunogenic composition.

Loosmore et al., teach an analog of *Haemophilus* Hin47 with reduced protease activity. The Hin47 heat shock protein is immunologically conserved among strains of

Art Unit: 1645

Haemophilus influenzae and is reported to have utility in vaccination against disease caused by *H. influenzae* or other bacterial pathogens that produce Hin47 or proteins capable of raising antibodies specifically reactive with Hin47 (col. 2 lines 16-21). The Hin47 protein is a protein that is an outer membrane protein with a molecular weight of about 47Kd (col. 2 lines 4-6). Therefore, Loosmore et al., teach that it would be advantageous to provide analogs of Hin47 that are substantially reduced in proteolytic activity for use as an antigen or to be included in other immunogenic preparations (col. 2 lines 29-34). The isolated and purified adhesin analog has decreased protease activity which is less than about 10% of natural Hin47, yet still retains substantially the same immunogenic properties, where at least one amino acid contributing to protease activity may be deleted or replaced by a different amino acid to produce reduced activity (col. 2 lines 44-54). "The at least one deleted or replaced amino acid may be selected from amino acids 195-201 of Hin47, and specifically may be Serine-197, which may be deleted or replaced by alanine. In addition, the at least one deleted or replaced amino acid may be Histidine-91 and may be deleted or replaced by alanine or lysine or arginine. Furthermore, the at least one deleted or replaced amino acid may be Asparagine-121 and may be deleted or replaced by alanine or glutamic acid" (col. 2 lines 56-64). An immunogenic composition comprising an immuno-effective amount of Hin47 analog may be formulated as a vaccine for *in vivo* administration to a host; including a human to confer protection against diseases caused by a bacterial pathogen, such as *Haemophilus influenzae* (col. 3 lines 47-59). The immunogenic composition may further comprise at least one other immunogenic or

Art Unit: 1645

immunostimulating material such as an adjuvant, and may be contained within a live vector such as a pox-virus, salmonella, poliovirus, adenovirus, vaccinia or BCG (col. 3-4 lines 60-2). The analogs may be used as carrier proteins to make conjugate vaccines against antigenic determinants unrelated to Hin47 including pathogenic bacteria (col. 7 lines 15-18 and 40-51). The Hin47 vaccines elicit an immune response that produces antibodies including anti-Hin47 antibodies, and opsonizing or bactericidal antibodies (col. 8 lines 20-31). The Hin47 analogs may be prepared with pharmaceutically acceptable carriers or adjuvants such as aluminum hydroxide or phosphate and should be administered in dosage ranges readily determinable by one skilled in the art (col. 8-9 lines 33-6). Vaccines can be combined with material from various or the same pathogen or from various strains of the same pathogen or from combinations of various pathogens (col. 9 lines 14-20). Example 10 illustrates the comparative immunogenicity of a Hin47 analog in mice, while example 11 illustrates the immunoprotective properties of the Hin47 analog. Table 2 shows the protective ability of anti-Hin47 mutant antiserum against *H.influenzae* infant rat model of bacteremia.

Art Unit: 1645

One would expect a reasonable level of success by combining the well known HMW adhesin proteins and the well known Hin47 analogs in a multi-component immunogenic composition since both Barenkamp et al., (WO 97/36,914), and Loosmore et al., teach the use of these antigens in immunogenic compositions against *Haemophilus influenzae*. Furthermore, both Barenkamp et al., (WO 97/36,914) and Loosmore et al., teach the use of adjuvants; the addition of antigenic components; and methods for immunizing a host against disease caused by an infection with *H. influenzae* comprising administration of the immunogenic composition. No more than routine skill was required at the time of appellants invention to combine two well known compositions, i.e., two different antigens of *H. influenzae*, each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition to be used for that very same purpose of providing an immunogenic composition.

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of applicant's invention to have an immunogenic composition to confer protection against *Haemophilus influenzae* comprising at least two different antigens, wherein one is a heat shock protein as taught by Loosmore et al., and the other is a high molecular weight adhesin protein, HMW1 or HMW2 which is an important protective antigen as taught by Barenkamp et al., (WO 97/36,914), because Loosmore et al., teach that analogs of Hin47 with reduced protease activity from *Haemophilus influenzae* are useful in vaccination against diseases caused by *H. influenzae* or other bacterial pathogens and these proteins are capable of eliciting protective opsonizing or bactericidal antibodies.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed October 22, 2001 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. It should be noted that in view of applicant's amendments, the rejection of claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) has been changed to a rejection of claims 6-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in view of the same prior art references. The substantive issues in the rejection remain the same.

5. Applicants urge that it is entirely out of context to suggest that on the basis of these disclosures, HMW protein would be combined with any one or a combination of herpes simplex virus vaccine and hepatitis B virus antigen in an immunogenic composition. Applicant's argue that the references have been taken out of context because the passages in Barenkamp et al., are discussing certain materials that may be used as adjuvants in the HMW containing immunogenic compositions and not that Hin47 may be combined with the HMW proteins of Barenkamp et al. Applicant's cite specific passages from the previous office actions stating that Barenkamp et al., teaching: targeting molecules used in combination with immunogenic compositions that include fragments of bacterial toxins; immunogenic compositions comprising at least one other immunogenic or immunostimulating materials and at least one adjuvant; and complexing additional components to the antigenic composition to enhance immune response including herpes simplex virus vaccine, pseudorabies virus vaccine, tetanus toxoid, poliomyelitis virus vaccine and hepatitis B virus antigen and others; but does not teach combining the Hin47 protein. However, this argument is not persuasive.

It is the examiner's position that no more than routine skill was required at the time of applicant's invention to combine two well known antigens of *H. influenzae*, an adhesin and a heat shock protein, since the prior art shows that both can elicit an immunogenic response in a host, both are useful to provide protection against a *H. influenzae* infection, both are useful in immunogenic composition in combination with other immunostimulating antigens. Accordingly, both are useful for the same purpose, to form an immunogenic composition to be used for that very same purpose. Applicant has provided no scientific data teaching away from the combination of two well-known *H. influenzae* antigens. Applicant neither argues, nor shows scientific data teaching unexpected results.

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of applicant's invention to have an immunogenic composition to confer protection against *Haemophilus influenzae* comprising at least two different antigens, encompassing a protective Hin47 analog protein as taught by Loosmore et al., and a protective high molecular weight adhesin protein, as taught by Barenkamp et al., (WO 97/36,914), because Loosmore et al., teaches that analogs of Hin47 useful in immunogenic compositions are capable of being combined with a variety of other antigens.

6. Applicant's urge that there is no suggestion that to combine the references since the Barenkamp et al., lack a specific teaching to combine the mutant Hin47 protein with the High Molecular Weight (HMW) protein in an immunogenic composition. This argument is not persuasive.

Art Unit: 1645

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In this case, it would have been obvious at the time of appellant's invention to have an immunogenic composition to confer protection against *Haemophilus influenzae* comprising at least two different antigens, where one is a well known high molecular weight adhesin protein, HMW1 or HMW2, which are important protective antigens that should comprise one component of a multi-component non-typeable *H. influenzae* vaccine as taught by Barenkamp et al., (WO 97/36,914), in combination with the analog of Hin47 which is a non-proteolytic heat shock protein with substantially reduced proteolytic activity useable in other immunogenic preparations as taught by Loosmore et al.

Furthermore, it is prima facie obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition to be used for the very same purpose. . . . [T]he idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art." In re Kerkhoven, 626 F.2d 846, 850, 205 USPQ 1069, 1072 (CCPA 1980) (citations omitted) (Claims to a process of preparing a spray-dried detergent by mixing together two

Art Unit: 1645

conventional spray-dried detergents were held to be prima facie obvious.). See also *In re Crockett*, 279 F.2d 274, 126 USPQ 186 (CCPA 1960) (Claims directed to a method and material for treating cast iron using a mixture comprising calcium carbide and magnesium oxide were held unpatentable over prior art disclosures that the aforementioned components individually promote the formation of a nodular structure in cast iron.); and *Ex parte Quadranti*, 25 USPQ2d 1071 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1992) (mixture of two known herbicides held prima facie obvious). See *In re Geiger*, 815 F.2d 686, 2 USPQ2d 1276 (Fed. Cir. 1987) ("Based upon the prior art and the fact that each of the three components of the composition used in the claimed method is conventionally employed in the art for treating cooling water).

In this case, no more than routine skill was required at the time of appellants invention to combine two well known antigens of *H. influenzae*, an adhesin and a heat shock protein, since the prior art shows that both: elicit an immunogenic response in a host; provide protection against a *H. influenzae* infection; and are useful in immunogenic composition in combination with other immunostimulating antigens. Accordingly, both antigens are useful for the same purpose, to form an immunogenic composition to be used for that very same purpose. Thus, applicant's argument is unpersuasive.

7. Applicant urges that it is only with hindsight of the present invention that any link can be made with the two proteins and that there is no motivation provided by either Barenkamp et al., or Loosmore et al., to selection the Hin47 analog of *H. influenzae* to combine with the HMW protein from the other potential known antigens. However, this argument is unpersuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

In this case, it would have been obvious at the time of applicant's invention to have an immunogenic composition to confer protection against *Haemophilus influenzae* comprising at least two different antigens, where one is a well known high molecular weight adhesin protein, HMW1 or HMW2, which are important protective antigens that should comprise one component of a multi-component non-typeable *H. influenzae* vaccine as taught by Barenkamp et al., (WO 97/36,914), in combination with the analog of Hin47 which is a non-proteolytic heat shock protein with substantially reduced proteolytic activity useable in other immunogenic preparations as taught by Loosmore et al.

Art Unit: 1645

8. Applicant again argues that there is no motivation provided from the disclosure of Barenkamp et al., to select the non-proteolytic analog of Hin47 protein of Loosmore et al., and there is no motivation to select the non-proteolytic analog of Hin47 for the purpose that the appellants make the selection and again, this argument is not persuasive.

It is prima facie obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition to be used for the very same purpose. . . . [T]he idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art." In re Kerkhoven, 626 F.2d 846, 850, 205 USPQ 1069, 1072 (CCPA 1980) (citations omitted). Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art at the time of appellant's invention to have an immunogenic composition to confer protection against *Haemophilus influenzae* comprising at least two different antigens, wherein one is a heat shock protein as taught by Loosmore et al., and the other is a high molecular weight adhesin protein, HMW1 or HMW2 which is an important protective antigen as taught by Barenkamp et al., (WO 97/36,914), because Loosmore et al., teach that analogs of Hin47 elicit an immune response capable of producing anti-Hin47, opsonizing or bactericidal antibodies, and provides data that shows Hin47 analogs provide protective ability.

Art Unit: 1645

As previously stated, it would have been obvious at the time of applicant's invention to have an immunogenic composition to confer protection against *Haemophilus influenzae* comprising at least two different antigens, where one is a high molecular weight adhesin protein, HMW1 or HMW2, since Barenkamp et al. (WO 97/36,914), teach that adhesin proteins are important protective antigens which should comprise one component of a multi-component non-typeable *H. influenzae* vaccine and the other component as taught by Loosmore et al., is an analog of Hin47 because the Hin47 analog can be used as a component in an immunogenic composition and can elicit anti-Hin47, opsonizing or bactericidal antibodies to provide an immunogenic response to *H. influenzae*. Furthermore, one would expect a reasonable level of success by combining the well-known HMW adhesin proteins and the well known Hin47 analogs in a multi-component immunogenic composition since both Barenkamp et al., (WO 97/36,914) and Loosmore et al., teach the use of these antigens in immunogenic compositions against *Haemophilus influenzae*.

9. Applicant argues that there is no indication that Barenkamp et al., teach that adhesin proteins are potentially important protective antigens that should comprise one component of a multi-component non-typeable *H. influenzae* vaccine.

However, it is the examiner's position that Barenkamp et al., teach an immunogenic composition comprising a HMW protein and at least one other immunogenic or immunostimulating material and at least one adjuvant (page 7 lines 1-5). Barenkamp et al. (WO 97/36,914), teach complexing additional components to the antigenic composition to enhance immune response including herpes simplex virus vaccine, pseudorabies virus vaccine, tetanus toxoid, poliomyelitis virus vaccine, hepatitis B virus antigen and others (page 24-25 lines 7-10). Finally, Barenkamp et al's., (WO 97/36,914) data teach "...that HMW adhesin proteins are potentially important protective antigens that may comprise one component of a multi-component NTHI (non-typeable *H. influenzae*) vaccine (page 49 lines 15-19). Thus, applicant's argument is not persuasive.

10. Applicant argues that there are important considerations when combining antigens in an immunogenic composition may be the possibility of impairing or adversely affecting the respective immunogenicities; and applicant's results could not have been predicted in advance from the information provided in Barenkamp et al, and Loosmore et al.

Art Unit: 1645

In response to applicant's arguments, the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985). One of ordinary skill would expect a reasonable level of success by combining the well known HMW adhesin proteins and the well known Hin47 analogs in a multi-component immunogenic composition since both Barenkamp et al., (WO 97/36,914), and Loosmore et al., teach the use of these antigens in immunogenic compositions against *Haemophilus influenzae* infection. No more than routine skill would have been required when both Barenkamp et al., (WO 97/36,914), and Loosmore et al., teach the additional use of adjuvants; the addition of antigenic components; and methods for immunizing a host against disease caused by an infection with *H. influenzae* comprising administration of different antigens of *H. influenzae* in an immunogenic composition.

Art Unit: 1645

11. Applicant again argues that there is no motivation provided from the disclosure of Barenkamp et al., to select the non-proteolytic analog of Hin47 protein of Loosmore et al., and there is no motivation to select the non-proteolytic analog of Hin47 for the purpose that the applicants make the selection. However, it is prima facie obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition to be used for the very same purpose. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have an immunogenic composition to confer protection against *Haemophilus influenzae* comprising at least two different antigens, wherein one is a heat shock protein as taught by Loosmore et al., and the other is a high molecular weight adhesin protein, HMW1 or HMW2 which is an important protective antigen as taught by Barenkamp et al. (WO 97/36,914), because Loosmore et al., teach that analogs of Hin47 elicit an immune response capable of producing anti-Hin47, opsonizing or bactericidal antibodies, and provides data that shows Hin47 analogs provide protective ability. Thus applicant's argument is not persuasive.

Art Unit: 1645

12. Applicant urges that they have not attacked the references individually, rather that appellant's have made the analyses referred to above to demonstrate a lack of motivation to combine the references to arrive at appellant's claimed invention.

However, this argument is not persuasive.

However, it is still the examiner's position that it would have been obvious at the time of applicant's invention to have an immunogenic composition to confer protection against *Haemophilus influenzae* comprising at least two different antigens, where one is a high molecular weight adhesin protein, HMW1 or HMW2, since Barenkamp et al., (WO 97/36,914), teach that adhesin proteins are important protective antigens which should comprise one component of a multi-component non-typeable *H. influenzae* vaccine and the other component as taught by Loosmore et al., is an analog of Hin47 because the Hin47 analog can be used as a component in an immunogenic composition and can elicit anti-Hin47, opsonizing or bactericidal antibodies to provide an immunogenic response to *H. influenzae*. Furthermore, one would expect a reasonable level of success by combining the well known HMW adhesin proteins and the well known Hin47 analogs in a multi-component immunogenic composition since both Barenkamp et al., (WO 97/36,914) and Loosmore et al., teach the use of these antigens in immunogenic compositions against *Haemophilus influenzae*.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejection should be maintained.

Art Unit: 1645

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ja-Na A Hines whose telephone number is 703-305-0487. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynette Smith can be reached on 703-308-3909. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-4242 for regular communications and 703-308-4242 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

Ja-Na Hines

January 7, 2002

Patricia A. Duffy
PATRICIA A. DUFFY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Lynette R. F. Smith
LYNETTE R. F. SMITH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600